

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

The drawings, abstract, disclosure, and claims stand objected to because of alleged informalities.

Claims 1, 2 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,272) (hereinafter “Brems”) in view of Waldman (U.S. Patent No. 5,157,719) (hereinafter “Waldman”)¹.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,098) (hereinafter “Baker”).

Claims 4-6 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Attwater et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,793) (hereinafter “Attwater”).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of Attwater, and in further view of Baker.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended the drawings, abstract, disclosure and claims to improve their form. Claims 1-15 remain pending for consideration.

¹ The Office Action actually cites to “Waldman (U.S. Patent 5,517,719).” Applicant’s undersigned representative placed a telephone call to Examiner James Wozniak in this regard on April 3, 2006. The Examiner informed Applicant that the Examiner inadvertently transposed some numbers in the Office Action with regard to this citation. The citation was intended to read “Waldman (U.S. Patent: 5,157,719).” Accordingly, the Examiner noted that the citation to U.S. Patent No. 5,517,719 in the Office Action and its associated PTO Form 892 was a typographical error. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner properly list U.S. Patent No. 5,157,719 on a PTO Form 892 with the next Office Communication.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because of particular alleged informalities as set forth by the Examiner at page 2, section 1 of the Office Action. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the use of the term “voice recognition” in the drawings of this application is improper. The Examiner points out that these objections are applied because “the term ‘voice recognition’ is misused from what nowadays is called --speech recognition-- in the speech signal processing art.” Accordingly, the Examiner requires appropriate correction to the drawings.

In response to the Examiner’s requirement, Applicant concurrently submits herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets in which the drawings are amended to replace all occurrences of “voice recognition” with “speech recognition” in accordance with the Examiner’s helpful suggestion. In addition, in an effort to render consistency throughout the drawings of this application, Applicant has opted to more generally change every occurrence of “voice” with --speech-- in response to the Examiner’s requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract and Disclosure

The abstract and disclosure are objected to because of particular alleged informalities as set forth by the Examiner at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. Similar to the objection to the drawings discussed above, the Examiner alleges that the use of the term “voice recognition” in the abstract and disclosure of this application is improper. Accordingly, the Examiner requires appropriate correction.

In response to the Examiner's requirement, Applicant has amended the abstract and specification to replace all occurrences of "voice recognition" with "speech recognition" in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. In addition, in an effort to render consistency throughout the disclosure of this application, Applicant has opted to more generally change every occurrence in the abstract and specification of "voice" with --speech-- in response to the Examiner's requirement.

Because the Examiner's requirement in this regard necessitated numerous amendments to the specification, Applicant hereby submits a substitute specification. Also included with the substitute specification is a substitute abstract that commences on a separate sheet, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(b)(1). For the convenience of the Examiner, a marked-up version showing the changes between the originally filed specification and Abstract and the substitute specification and new Abstract is submitted herewith.

Applicant has submitted this substitute specification including changes to the originally filed disclosure to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicant respectfully requests that the substitute specification be entered into this application in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125(b). Applicant respectfully submits that these changes to the instant application are being implemented in response to the Examiner's requirement at page 2 of the Office Action and they are consistent with the Examiner's suggested changes. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute new matter. Withdrawal of the objections to the abstract and specification is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 stand objected to for alleged informalities. Applicant has amended various claims in accordance with the Examiner's comments in the Office Action at page 3, sections 3 and 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Baker. Claims 4-6 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, and further in view of Attwater. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brems in view of Waldman, in view of Attwater, and in further view of Baker. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

At page 4 of the Office Action, with regard to the rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner concedes that Brems "does not specifically suggest:

Connecting a plurality of voice recognition dictionaries with each other, the plurality of voice recognition dictionaries corresponding to the plurality of regions, respectively (*dividing phone numbers within a memory into subgroups according to line access digit, area code, and a 7 digit local number, Col. 4, Lines 46-61, and voice recognition compatibility, Col. 18, Lines 46-50*)."

However, the Examiner then applies Waldman as allegedly curing the deficiencies of Brems in this regard. Such an interpretation of Waldman is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Applicant respectfully submits that Waldman does not teach, or even suggest, the audio recognition method described in independent claim 1 of the instant application including at least the feature of “connecting a plurality of speech recognition dictionaries with each other, the plurality of speech recognition dictionaries corresponding to the plurality of regions, respectively.” Applicant respectfully submits that Waldman does not teach, or even suggest, a plurality of dictionaries in the manner described in independent claim 1.

Similar arguments also apply to the remaining independent claims 4 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Brems nor Waldman, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 8, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1, 4 or 8, and the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the additionally applied reference to Baker, with respect to claims 3 and 7, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Brems and Waldman. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the additionally applied reference to Attwater, with respect to claims 4-7 and 12-15, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Brems and Waldman.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: April 18, 2006

By:


Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 55694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Attached is a Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets including a change to each of Figs. 1, 10 and 11. These Replacement Drawing Sheets, which include all of Figs. 1-11 in this application, replace the previously-filed drawing sheets. In these Replacement Drawing Sheets, Fig. 1, 10 and 11 have been amended to replace all occurrences of “VOICE” with --SPEECH--, in response to the Examiner’s comments at page 2, section 1 of the Office Action.